

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed September 3, 2004 has been carefully considered.

Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants are grateful for the indication of allowability of claims 1-9 if the claims 1-9 are amended so as to meet the formalities as the Examiner suggested in the Office Action. Claims 1,3, 4, 5, 7, 8, and 9 have been amended to meet the formalities or correct editorial matters. No new matter has been added.

Claim Objections

Claim 1-9 are objected to because of the following informalities.

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner correctly pointed out that 1) the variable M or m should be consistent throughout the claim, 2) "input signals" should be replaced by --the input signals-- in lines 4, 6, and 11 to avoid a plurality of definition because the "p input signals" is defined in the preamble., and 3) the phrase "comprising summing means" should be replaced by --comprising a summing means-- in line 13. Accordingly, claim 1 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner.

Regarding claim 3, the Examiner correctly pointed out that the phrase "wherein first and second means" in line 1 should be replaced by --wherein the first and second means--. Accordingly, claim 3 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner.

Regarding claim 5, the Examiner stated that the connection between the flip-flops should be properly defined by defining connections between a first and a second flip-flop rather than only defining connections between a flip-flop.

However, as shown in Fig. 9 and described in the specification, more than 3 of cells (B^p) or (B^i), each of which consists of a flip-flop, may be included in the filter. Thus, to more clearly recite the connection between the flip-flops, claim 5 has been amended by specifying the ranks of flip-flops in the connection.

Regarding claim 8, the Examiner correctly pointed out that “the processing means” of line lacks antecedent basis. The words “the processing means” in claim 8 is not necessary to describe the present invention. Accordingly, claim 8 has been amended by deleting “the processing means.” Furthermore, “two first DOT and CROSS signals” has been amended to -- a first DOT and a first CROSS signals -- as suggested by the Examiner.

Regarding claim 9, the Examiner correctly pointed out that the first differential demodulation circuit DD(I) is incorrectly noted as DOT (I) in line 5. Accordingly, claim 9 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Also, to avoid the lack of antecedent basis, “the processing means” in claim 9 has been deleted.

Furthermore, the abstract has been amended to meet the formalities as suggested by the Examiner.

Conclusion

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited to our deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

THELEN REID & PRIEST, LLP

Dated: Dec 23, 2004



Robert E. Krebs

Reg. No. 25,885

Thelen Reid & Priest LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
Tel. (408) 292-5800
Fax. (408) 287-8040